

## David Gregory Hosts NBC's "Meet the Press"

### [LIST OF SPEAKERS](#)

---

GREGORY:

This Sunday, the President is trying something new to see if he can get along with Republicans and get something done on the budget.

Stocks are flying high. The jobless rate is down as of Friday's unemployment report. But what will unlock a sustained economic rebound? Dealing with the debt is one way and the President tried reaching out to some key members of the Senate to break the stalemate.

So we wonder this week why can't Washington get along? The search for real solutions this morning, plus reaction to Senator Rand Paul's filibuster this week.

A special discussion with some key senators, some young members of Congress, plus former GOP Congressman from Florida, Joe Scarborough.

Also this morning, a big week for the potential 2016 Republican field. We talk to former Florida Governor Jeb Bush about immigration and more.

And our roundtable grapples with the latest contribution to the debate on women, motherhood and work. Facebook executive Sheryl Sandberg's book called "Lean In".

ANNOUNCER:

From NBC News in Washington the world's longest running television program. This is MEET THE PRESS WITH DAVID GREGORY.

GREGORY:

And good Sunday morning. I can tell you from some of my reporting this week that the President has realized that if he's going to get something done in Washington, he's got to create some different kind of consensus among Republicans in the Senate and maybe even in the House to achieve that still illusive grand bargain on the budget. He's going to head up to Capitol Hill this week.

A couple of major areas to watch from my point of view, is there any ratio of spending cuts to tax increases Republicans can actually accept? Particularly if, number two, the President persuades the Democrats to go along with a big reform of entitlement programs, Social Security and Medicare.

All of this leads to a special discussion this morning -- can't we all just get along? Joining me: the always outspoken former Republican Congressman from Florida, host of MSNBC's "Morning Joe", Joe Scarborough; former governor and now Democratic Senator from Virginia Tim Kaine; Republican Senator from Oklahoma, Tom Coburn, he was one of the 11 Republican Senators that President Obama had dinner with earlier this week; and two younger members of Congress, two fresh voices, freshman Democrat and one of the first female combat veterans in Congress, Tulsi Gabbard of Hawaii and Republican Congressman Cory Gardner of Colorado. Welcome to all of you.

GARDNER:

Thank you.

GREGORY:

Great to have you here and a lot to talk about. Senators Kaine and Coburn, let me start with you. Before we talk tactics, let's talk about the news. And we've got the potential for a budget deal by July, Senator Coburn? That's what the President would like. How real do you think that is as a prospect?

COBURN:

Well, I think something is going to get done before the political -- political ramifications of 2014 start playing. You've got to have somewhat of an agreement or an outline before that. But David, one of the points I'd make is the fact that this is news, is news in itself because it shouldn't be news that the President is reaching out in a bipartisan fashion to try to solve problems for the country.

And it just shows you he is moving in the right direction. I'm proud of him for doing it and I think it's a great thing but it shouldn't be news.

GREGORY:

What about the substance of it, though, Senator Coburn? What did you hear this week? What are -- where are some of the discussions going that give you an actual path toward a real solution that's been elusive on a big budget deal?

COBURN:

Well, I think the one thing I heard is the first indication is the President is going to start talking to the American public about the problem. I mean we all know that you -- you put in \$1 for Medicare and get out \$3.30. We understand that. But nobody has ever talked to the American public about that. And nobody has led on that issue as far as a President wanting to change it.

So it's -- I'm welcoming with open arms. I think the President is tremendously sincere. I don't think this is just a political change in tactic. I think he actually would like to solve the problems of the country and it would be to his benefit and certainly every Americans' benefit if he did that.

So it's time to start leading. And the way you do that is quit poking your finger in people's eyes and start building relationships. And I think he's got a great chance to accomplish a big deal.

GREGORY:

Senator Kaine, I don't want to just focus on tactics, I want to focus on news and developments, where in the budget deal is there room for compromise?

KAINE:

David, first I think it is important to look at the steps that all the sides you're taking toward one other. So at year end, you know much not to like about the Bush tax cut deal but it was compromise. The House early in the year decided they weren't going to use the debt -- the threat of repudiating debt as leverage anymore. That was positive. The Senate said we'll write a budget again for the first time in ordinary course since 2009. I think this week you're going to find us working out an FY-13 budget. You know we've been working off the CR because we couldn't reach an agreement. You're going to see both sides work that out and you're going to start see both houses put out their budgets, laying out visions for how to keep the economy strong and also deal with the deficit.

The two House budgets will be different. We put our pay checks on the line if we don't pass budgets off the House by mid-April, we'll all stop getting paid. And then we'll have a conference where we can put the two visions on the table. But I do agree with what -- you know with what Tom said. At the end of the day we're going to have to find a balanced solution and it will involve all elements. It will involve talking about revenues, talking about expenses, talking about entitlements. We have to do that.

GREGORY:

So Joe Scarborough is an elder statesman in your party in many ways.

SCARBOROUGH:

Oh many ways.

GREGORY:

I know, I can't believe I just said that.

SCARBOROUGH:

Yes.

GREGORY:

No but if somebody who's trying to think differently about the party and where it goes. Why the change? Here was the President earlier this year being asked about socializing with Congress but about reaching across the aisle, about trying to form different kinds of coalitions. This is what he said then.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

BARACK OBAMA, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES:

I like Speaker Boehner personally. And you know when we went out and played golf, we had a great time, but that didn't get a deal done in 2011.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

GREGORY:

Yes and so but now it changed. Now he's trying something different. Why? Why do you think he's changing it up?

SCARBOROUGH:

He's been here long enough to figure it out. To figure out that actually the things that he brushed aside, schmoozing or golfing or that special sauce that he was talking about recently, he understands that Governors like Tim Kaine and Governors like Chris Christie have to do that every day.

He's known Tom Coburn for a very long time. He's starting to talk to Tom again. I think that's very important. But it matters. You know I always go back to the 1990s and talk about the fact -- I -- I remember the first time

I met Erskine Bowles. I said, "Man, I can't stand your boss, he is Chief of Staff for Bill Clinton." He said "That's all right, Congressman, he hates you too."

But you look what we did together. Tom and myself we didn't care for the President, the President didn't care for us. We didn't understand each other. Yet we balanced the budget for the first time in a generation, four years in a row for the first time since the '20s, the welfare reform, tax reform. I mean you've -- you've got to do that.

And I remember talking to Bill Clinton this past year, because David Axelrod -- this always made David Axelrod angry when we'd talk about how Bill Clinton and Congress got along. He goes, "You impeached him." And Bill Clinton said, "Yes, but even on that day I was talking to Newt Gingrich on the phone about Iraq and protecting the American people. That's what we have to do today, even if the President doesn't like Congress and vice versa. They can get along and put the country's interests ahead of their own party.

GREGORY:

So let's talk to a couple of members of Congress a little bit newer to Washington. Congresswoman, again, if there's a negotiation that's going on in a slightly cooler atmosphere where we're not in the middle of fiscal crisis, do you sense more inclination to get something done?

GABBARD:

Absolutely. I really see great opportunity here for a few reasons. One is because you don't have these kind of created crises that are constantly happening. It creates an opportunity for those of us who have come here with a very clear mandate from people in our districts, both Republicans and Democrats that we want to see action. We want to see you guys sit down, spend some time together and talk through things.

And in order for that to happen, there has to be a basic level of respect, sincere discussion, listening and consideration. And there will be things, of course, we disagree on but there will be things that we can agree on and that's really where the opportunity I see that lies ahead.

GREGORY:

But Congressman, I would gather on some of this budget talk, particularly -- well, let me ask it this way. Is there any -- any ratio of spending cuts to tax increases that you could accept or vote for?

KAINE:

Well, the President got over \$600 billion worth of taxes at the beginning of this year. We know that this town has a spending problem. We're going to have record revenues in 2013, as the economics have already

shown, the economists have already shown.

And so the bottom line is this, what can we do to bring spending under control? We've spent it, we have record revenue this year. It's already been taxed. Now it's time to reduce spending and get this country growing economically again.

GREGORY:

And Senator Coburn, this question of spending and even the impact of the sequester is something that you've taken on, with through on Twitter and elsewhere where you're talking about sequester this. You've identified lots of areas where spending can be cut. And this is where you disagree with the President who thinks that ultimately the sequester is going to have economic harm, that there's no way around it.

COBURN:

Well, you know, that's just a difference of opinion. We need to give the President and his administration some flexibility with the sequester. But I've spent eight years looking at every spending item in the federal government, and we waste easily \$200 billion a year in totally ineffective or duplicative programs.

So to say -- and I'm -- look, I'm not going to stop peppering him. I've got an ammo-drawer full of things to complain about when they're going to say we're not going to have enough people in the FAA towers or they can't get a ship back, refuel, I can show them all the things, the stupid things they have done over the last two years that we can stop doing that we can do everything that we need to do in this country.

So look, the real problem, David, is Washington is dysfunctional, but it's dysfunctional in a dysfunctional way. Members of Congress and the administration agree on too much. We agree on spending money we don't have. We agree on not over sighting the programs that should be over sighted. We agree on continuing to spend money on programs that don't work or are ineffective.

I mean, we -- basically we agree on too much. We need to move back and start agreeing about what's the long-term plan and how do we oversight this government to get real value of the things that are legitimate roles for the government for the American people.

SCARBOROUGH:

You know, I think Tom Coburn and I both wrote a book in 2004 separately without knowing about it complaining about in 2004 how Republicans were spending too much. We've gotten to where we've gotten because, as Tom said, both sides have agreed for too long over the past decade on the same things, spending a lot of money without paying for it.

You know Barack Obama, I've got to say, and I agree with Tom again, I think a great sign is that the President is now talking privately about Medicare and the crisis that we face in Medicare, because remember during the State of the Union he said, oh, we can make some modest adjustments to Medicare.

Go back and see what he said in 2006, 2007, 2008. Where he said Medicare was the real crisis. Social Security was the real crisis. He said we were stealing from future generations. If the President will talk about that, if we will get a grand bargain that's going to take care of the generational theft that's going on, Republicans will agree --

(CROSSTALK)

GREGORY:

But Congresswoman, the President hasn't talked about it. I mean, the President has been talking about it, he's been talking about it with Republican leadership but ultimately has not been committing to anything that -- that even his own party could agree to and in some ways has committed to some things the party disagrees with.

GABBARD:

Right exactly. And I think that's why it's important that first of all, these conversations are happening. I think frustration by the American people and frustration by members of Congress as well have stemmed from the fact that a lot of these debates have taken place on TV or on the House floor and not had very meaningful discussion.

So we can figure out areas we can agree on, areas that Senator Coburn has identified, wastes within Medicare that we can agree needs to be cut. Issues like prescription drug negotiations for Medicare to bring the costs down. I think everyone agrees that the rising costs of health care is the driver, one of the main drivers --

(CROSSTALK)

GREGORY:

But how do you react -- but how do you react to your own colleague here who is saying, as many conservatives do, we're done. We're done on revenue. And that's why I keep asking this question. There's really no ratio, no matter how much there is of spending cuts, that Republicans, your chamber will agree to in any new revenues, even if it comes from tax reform. How do you bridge that divide?

GABBARD:

Well I think that's where we really have to be creative and talk through what are the options that are out there. When we talk about making it so that Medicare can negotiate with these prescription drug companies. That right there is on average around \$14 billion a year. We look at some of the major tax loopholes that exist. Again, I appreciate the work that Senator Coburn has done and -- and read a lot of it to see where are these areas that we can agree that we can cut back.

(CROSSTALK)

COBURN:

But David --

KAINE:

And David we're working on a budget right now. Just you know if we're going to talk about spending and we need, to and as a governor I had to cut a lot of spending, we have to look at spending through the tax code as well and that -- it does offer us an opportunity. Senator Coburn has done some really good work to point out we are giving away in the tax code about \$1.3 trillion a year in the series of loopholes, deductions, credits, exceptions.

I mean, if you just reduce that loophole amount by a modest percentage, then you can find a balanced way to start to deal with the deficit and many Republicans in the Senate are open to that strategy.

SCARBOROUGH:

David if you're the House Republican though where are you going to send a Republican and you go home this spring for town hall meetings and you're already talking about raising taxes again, people are going to say, wait, hold on a second, you already raised taxes once this year. And then you cut defense spending. And the President is still saying we don't have to do anything about Medicare, about Medicaid, about Social Security? I'm sorry it's the President's move. He needs to say publicly and give Congressmen and Congresswomen, he's got to give them some cover and the President won't do that publicly. When he does, then anything is possible.

GARDNER:

And for the past two months we've been going through these -- the fights over the sequester across-the-board spending cuts. The American people saw their tax increases by two percent 80 percent of households, nearly 80 percent of households across this country saw their taxes increase by two percent, some by far



more than that.

And now government is just asking itself to reduce its spending by a little over two percent and yet that has been a paralyzing fight in this town. I think what -- time will tell whether this overture, whether the President's attempt to rebuild relationships or to in many cases build relationships with Congress for the first time is truly genuine. I hope they are.

But the last time that we witnessed Paul Ryan be invited to a speech that the President was giving before the American public, he then turned around and chastised him. The last time we went over to the White House, the President lectured us. And so I hope that he's genuine but I don't think we're going to be doing the Harlem Shake any time soon together. I think we can actually use this chance to see what's going to happen.

KAINE:

I think the big issue, though, you know we can ask the President to do more, but the only fix of Congress is Congress's to fix. And most Americans, they don't look at the presidency and say it's broken or the judicial branch is broken, but they do look at Congress and say that it's broken.

So that means it's up to Cory and Tulsi and Tom and me and our colleagues to finally get off the gimmicks, the sequesters, the CRs, the super committees and get back to normal budgetary talks.

GREGORY:

Senator Coburn, I want to go back to you. I'm struck by your line that Washington can't even get dysfunction right. (inaudible) but, you know, there is also a tendency to hand-wring in Washington, to talk about how bad it is. And I remember one of the more contentious things I covered back in the Senate, and that was in 1856 in the Kansas-Nebraska act when there was an actual caning and we have the image of it, a caning on the Senate floor and this contentious debate. Sumner involved, of course, and there was a speech that was critical of someone's cousin and there was a caning on the Senate floor. You fast forward and what gets attention these days is the use of the filibuster. Here was Rand Paul this week on the drone policy, here's a piece of what he did.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

SEN. RAND PAUL, (R), KENTUCKY:

I rise today to begin to filibuster John Brennan's nomination for the CIA. I will speak until I can no longer speak. I will speak as long as it takes.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

GREGORY:

And it was 13 plus hours. He got pretty high marks actually.

SCARBOROUGH:

He's a rookie. 13 hours? Come on.

GREGORY:

There was some bipartisan support if not substantively at least for the use of the filibuster. Are we really as bad as we say we are, Senator?

COBURN:

No. But the first thing you heard was because he filibustered and he actually did it the way they want him to do it, they actually go out there and spend the time to speak complaining about the filibuster again.

Look, Adams talked about and Madison talked about the tyranny of the majority. The reason the Senate is designed the way it is, is to make sure that minority rights are always protected. And, you know, quite frankly, is we've gone from a little bit of being spoiled when you have 60-plus senators to not getting your way every time and then when the rules are used to actually create an issue that is important to a senator like Rand Paul and spend time on it, I think was very -- regardless of what you think about the issue -- it's very important American people see the human side and the issues and the debates about important -- whether it's a civil liberty or whether it's an issue on spending, that we actually spend the time to do it.

You know, the Senate spends 70 percent of its time in a quorum call, which is nothing positive. So, you know, I think this was a great opportunity for a young, new -- sophomore senator to make his point and he got a lot of support for it, whether you agree with him or not. That's what the Senate was designed to do is to actually come out there --

GREGORY:

Let me ask a substantive point -- two members of Congress who were not actually around after the attack of 9/11, you weren't in Congress yet and this whole debate about drones and presidential power. Would you as members of Congress like to see Congress have a real debate about whether the President still should have the same level of authority he has in the realm of executive power, national security, to fight this war on

terror, as President Bush got from Congress? Should Congress have the guts to step up and have that debate?

GARDNER:

I'd like to see a real debate on many things in Congress, especially this issue. I think the issue over drones, authority of the president when it comes to war powers, executive powers, actions in Iraq, Iran; what's happening in the United States with drones and the failure of this administration to answer Senator Paul's questions in a timely fashion.

And so I would like to see that debate and I think Congress needs to reinsert itself into its constitutional role.

As a veteran, congresswoman, do you think the President should have all the authority that President Bush first received after 9/11?

GABBARD:

This is an area where Cory and I agree. We have a great responsibility in Congress, and from my background and my experience, obviously come in with a firsthand perspective on the value of these counterterrorism tactics and strategies during a time of war overseas in enemy territory, and that being the appropriate place for them, not here on American soil.

And it is our responsibility to hold hearings because it's an important discussion that the American people are very concerned about, as are we, and we have to set the parameters for what the measures will be.

SCARBOROUGH:

I actually thought that was one of the highlights of what I've seen coming out of the Senate in quite some time where you had somebody going on the floor and it wasn't about tactics. It was about an issue that matters a lot to a lot of us.

You know, I've been concerned for some time that the President has been able to have drone attacks; again, with very little supervision. "The New York Times" reported he's got a kill list. He decides who he's going to target and who he's not. You not only had an American citizen killed overseas, you then had an American citizen's son killed overseas while he was at a restaurant. The response as to why he was killed from a White House official was because he should have had a better father.

This is problematic. And when Rand Paul asks does the United States -- and asks Eric Holder, does the United States have the right to kill an American citizen on American soil with a drone, and the White House drags their feet, that's really problematic. I think Rand Paul did a great service.

GREGORY:

Let me get in, I have about a minute left here and I want to -- I'll just bring in another thing that has to do with tone, my conversation with Jeb Bush. And we talked about the tone that a president can set, but it also speaks to whether and how the minority party should compromise at this particular juncture. Let me show you a piece of that particular interview.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

GREGORY:

Isn't it interesting, though, you're sitting at the Reagan Library as we talk today. And yet the President you speak of and so many conservatives do raised taxes, was for immigration reform that a lot of modern day conservatives would find quite distasteful. Could he exist? Could he get elected in today's Republican Party or would he be seen as a liberal?

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

BUSH:

He also stopped the advancement of the federal government's overreach. He cut taxes in a dramatic way. He found common ground to extend the life of social security. He did all this in a way that didn't violate his principles, but he was -- he also didn't try to demonize his opponent. He embraced them. He embraced his opponents, and because of that found a lot more common ground.

So the climate was different then than it is today, but we could restore that climate. I think that would be very positive for our country.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

GREGORY:

The rest of that interview coming up in a few minutes. Senator Kaine, I think it's an appropriate note to end on. Does President Obama learn from that?

KAINE:

I think he does. And look, I think this has been a good discussion and I'm seeing it in the Senate now. Don't

demonize your opponents. Stand up for your principles but Virginians tell me everywhere I go, around sequester or anything else, just go to Washington and make a deal. However the deal is cut. If you can compromise and work together with the other side, I had to do it with two Republican houses when I was governor, and that's what we all ought to be doing together.

Hey, spring is in the air so maybe we --

GREGORY:

Senator Coburn, is there something different? I know you've been critical of the President for demonizing Republicans. Do you sense anything is different? I'm not just talking about one dinner, but I'm talking about different portals for discussion and compromise.

COBURN:

Well, I think -- you know, I think if you sit back and look at where we are and the problems in front of us and whether or not this President, my friend, is going to lead the country in solving problems that will make a major difference in everybody's life ten years from now and for him not to do everything to try to solve that is ridiculous.

So, you know, I think he gets it. And I think he's genuinely reaching out. But you've got a lot of -- you've got a lot of scabs and sores on people that it's going to take a while for that to heal. And if we're consistently reaching out and consistently working, people in the Senate -- the Senate is not near as dysfunctional as it's made out to be because there's great relationships in the Senate. Our problem in the Senate is the leadership of the Senate, not the members of the Senate.

GREGORY:

All right. I'm going to have to make that the last word. Thank you all very much. To be continued and I appreciate your comments this morning.

SCARBOROUGH:

Can you believe he could only go 13 hours?

(CROSSTALK)

SCARBOROUGH:

Better shoes, that's all he needed.

GREGORY:

We have particular training for that, talking endlessly.

Coming up here, the debate started by Facebook executive Sheryl Sandberg about women and success at work; why is she a target instead of a role model?

Joining me, former White House press secretary Dee Dee Myers; Republican congresswoman from Tennessee, Marsha Blackburn; senior strategist of the McCain-Palin campaign back in 2008, Steve Schmidt; and columnist for the "Washington Post", Ruth Marcus. And in a few minutes, my conversation with former Florida Governor Jeb Bush as well. We're coming back after this break.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

GREGORY:

From politics to a new pope, around here when we talk about covering an election, we're usually referring to primaries and caucuses, but next week it's all about the conclave. Late last week the Vatican announced that the process to elect the next pope will start Tuesday. It won't be the electoral college, per se, but the college of cardinals.

After celebrating mass at St. Peter's basilica, the 117 cardinals that are eligible to vote will process to the Sistine Chapel where they will sit and pray before casting their ballot. The magic number here is 77, which is a two-thirds plus one majority. The voting can stretch over several days, including a pause for prayer after every third day.

For Pope Benedict it took four ballots over two days. The first sign that a new pope has been selected, white smoke from the chimney.

Coming up here, my interview with Jeb Bush and the debate that Facebook executive Sheryl Sandberg sparked about women in the workplace that has so many people talking.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

GREGORY:

Yes, that's the book right there, "Lean In" by Sheryl Sandberg of Facebook that has gotten a lot of people talking. You're talking about it, we're talking about it. And I'm going to do it with former White House press

secretary for President Clinton, Democratic strategist and author of "Why Women should Rule the World, Dee Dee Myers; former adviser to the 2008 McCain presidential campaign, Republican strategist, Steve Schmidt; columnist for the "Washington Post" Ruth Marcus; and Congresswoman from Tennessee and author of the book "Life Equity: Realize Your True Value and Pursue Your Passions at Any Stage in Life, Marsha Blackburn.

Welcome to all of you. I've got great advice on leading this discussion from my wife, Beth, who says just keep quiet and let others speak. So I want to raise this, and I think the thing that struck me as I really followed this week, look at "Time" magazine where Sheryl Sandberg is on the cover and what the headline "Don't Hate Her Because She's Successful: Facebook's Sheryl Sandberg and Her Mission to Reboot Feminism."

And Ruth Marcus, isn't it amazing that her blueprint for how women can be successful at work is greeted with the word hate -- don't hate her.

MARCUS:

Right. And as we were saying don't hate -- nobody would ever say about a man don't hate him because he's successful.

Look, if nature abhors a vacuum, it loves a good cat fight. And she is attractive. She is smart. She is young. She's impossibly rich and impossibly successful. What's not to get the claws out.

And I blame actually for a change us women, because she said something provocative. She said something worth debating, but why is it that we need to debate it by sort of acting as if we passed around a note in junior high school saying, hey, everybody, let's be mean to Sheryl today.

GREGORY:

Why is the instinct, congresswoman, for women to be resentful of this sort of advice? Is it a sense that it's incomplete? She doesn't get it? She comes from different circumstances? What, how do you describe that?

BLACKBURN:

I think that women are constantly pushing to get the recognition that they so rightly deserve. As we have taught, you've always got to be twice as prepared as any man as you go into a room and participate in a debate. And I'm a huge cheerleader, I'm so thrilled Sheryl wrote her book. And I am pleased that Dee Dee has done her documentary and done her book. And I like that Ruth is out there talking about it and Steve supporting us.

And you know, I think that what women have to do is realize it takes all of us pushing and being that trail blazer, pushing through that ceiling, in order for others to come along on that path. Somebody has got to go first.

GREGORY:

Let me define as simply as I can what I think the major thrust of this advice is from Sheryl Sandberg. What does Leaning In mean? She talks about it with Norah O'Donnell on "60 Minutes" over at CBS this evening. Here's a piece of that.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

SHERYL SANDBERG, FACEBOOK COO:

They start leaning back. They say oh, I'm busy, I want to have a child one day, I couldn't possibly take on any more, or I'm still learning on my current job. I've never had a man say that stuff to me.

NORAH O'DONNELL, CBS NEWS CORRESPONDENT:

You're suggesting women aren't ambitious?

SANDBERG:

I'm not suggesting women aren't ambitious. Plenty of women are as ambitious as men, but I'm saying, and I want to say it unequivocally and unapologetically, that the data is clear that when it comes to ambition to lead, to be the leader of whatever you're doing, men, boys outnumber girls and women.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

GREGORY:

So the point is that women, she argues, lean back too often, too early. They don't lean in, they don't demand that seat at the table. So my understanding of it is to say, look, she's saying ignore what male colleagues or this message that they're sending you, ignore a lot of the societal messages about leaning back as a woman and really lean in here at work, in your career, whatever you want to do.

MYERS:



I think one of the things that she does -- we're all very familiar with the external obstacles to women's success, Marsha was just talking about one of them is that you expected to be twice as good. But what she really focuses on, because -- and she acknowledges every single one of those, and says she's bumped up against every single one of them -- but what she's really focusing on is what are the internal obstacles that hold women back, what do we do to ourselves. And we know those are true too.

Women don't raise their hands for promotion. They don't raise their hand for office. I don't know why you ran, but so many women think, well, if I just wait a couple more years, if I just become a little more of an expert on this policy issue, I'll be ready to run when they are really ready and the men that are less prepared are already out there in the campaign.

Women who are executives see all the time in women who they think are talented and qualified are not promoting themselves and not doing what the men are doing in order to get that next big job. So they need to do it.

BLACKBURN:

Women kind of wait to be invited.

MYERS:

Correct.

BLACKBURN:

And men just push their way through. And I think that that's kind of the difference.

MARCUS:

And I think this is her big contribution to the debate, which is helping make us more aware of how we do this to ourselves. Granted the external obstacles that we're worried about looking rude at a roundtable if we interrupt somebody and in the sort of longer term we may be thinking about, well, what if, I'm an associate at a law firm and I might get married some day and I might have children. So -- and she talks about leaving before you leap. I think it's really important, but I also think it also answers the question, David, of why it's so controversial, which is this is something that hits all of us close to home.

If we're deciding to stay home with our children, we could feel criticized by this. So that is not her intention. If we don't have the flexibility or the luxury of choosing to stay home, which most women don't, they're working because they need the paycheck, we could feel criticized and resentful of her.

And so because she's talking about something that really hits at the core of our beings I think is why the hate word comes up.

GREGORY:

In the realm of politics, if I can just bring Steven on this, I mean here you...

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:

Poor Steve.

GREGORY:

No. We have a voice in this, at least some perspective on it. And, look, in the political realm you worked closely with Sarah Palin. One of the things that strikes me about Sarah Palin, here was a conservative woman who was a relatively new governor and she jumps into this huge new level of presidential politics, and she was living a life that really Sheryl Sandberg is advocating. Her husband, Todd, was by her side, a true partner in what they were doing and totally supportive in a way that Sheryl Sandberg says you've got to have in a partner if you're going to be able to lean in and be successful in the way that she was.

SCHMIDT:

Absolutely. And Todd Palin was a full partner, he is a great partner. He was in a lot of ways in my view a person who made her career possible as a gubernatorial candidate, a governor, ultimately as a vice presidential candidate, but I think that's true in any successful marriage, whether it is the fully supportive female partner or the fully supportive male partner.

The reality is, is no one knows what goes on in anyone else's marriage. But for there to be success, for there to be happiness on this one lap around the track we all get, you want to have full partnership.

And I think in any organization where women are not at the table, where it is skewed male in today's day and age, that's an organization that's deficient, that's an organization that's going to have problems. It's one of the problems we have structurally in the Republican Party. We don't have enough women at the table.

But any company, any organization in today's day and age, that doesn't give equal opportunity to women, that doesn't advance women to the table is going to be an organization that has difficulty competing.

GREGORY:

And isn't that interesting, congresswoman, you talk about it. I mean, there is the culture in the Republican Party about the next in line. Well, women aren't always the next in line.

BLACKBURN:

Well, that's exactly right. And what women have to do is jump the queue. And sometimes that causes resentment from men and other women also, because if you are too aggressive or if you are outspoken in a manner that a man would be, then you are looked at as being too much so for a women, but you do have to jump that queue because we have not had enough women stepping up to move to that national forefront and being on a national ticket. And you have to kind of make your way. You can't wait to be invited, you have to go back and build on the skill set that you have and -- as Ruth is talking about.

And then you have to have not only a supportive husband but a supportive family.

(CROSSTALK)

MARCUS:

One of the points that Sheryl Sandberg makes is that success correlates negatively with likability. The more successful you are, the less likable you are.

MYERS:

For a woman.

MARCUS:

For a woman, not for a man. There's no problem being a successful man. And that women just have to bite the bullet on that cultural reality.

GREGORY:

But does that mean...

(CROSSTALK)

GREGORY:

...because that's what the article points out, she's saying that women should act more like a man in the workplace?

MYERS:

Well, no. I don't think that's what she says. I think what she's saying is you need to be aware of that negative correlation between success and likability and figure out your own way to navigate it.

You're interrupting me and that is really very unattractive in a woman.

(CROSSTALK)

MYERS:

No, but so once you point out that fact, that people correlate likability to success and say, hey, you're penalizing this successful person because she's a woman, that it changes that dynamic. And so by talking about it, by elevating the issue, but pointing it out to people, you can begin to address it, which is important.

BLACKBURN:

And part of it is that some men are not comfortable, even in this day and age, they're not comfortable with having a woman as a decision-maker. And so that -- that kind of clouds the issue.

GREGORY:

How do men respond to this? I mean, I think there's an aspect in any workplace where, you know, men, if they're in truly equal partnerships with their wives are thinking about their own schedules, sort of putting this on the agenda in some way. And then the other question I talk about with my wife is what is it that we want for our daughters? Do we want Sheryl Sandberg to be part of the spectrum of choices? We absolutely hope that this is somebody that you can become.

You may choose to do something else, you may choose to stay home and raise kids and that's great too. But this is certainly someone that you should emulate.

SCHMIDT:

I have two daughters. I don't want there to be any limits on their horizons. I want them to achieve at the highest level of their abilities, to do whatever they want to do. My wife made the decision to give up her

career to stay home with our children. I think that's admirable work, I think it's to be admired. And in our marriage, in our partnership, that's what works for us. But you don't want women to have any low horizons, that they are forced to make decisions because there are limits out there that have been imposed.

And I think certainly for people of my generation, and I'm 42 years old, we've been accustomed over my entire work life to working with women. And in the firm that I work for, women represent roughly half of the senior leadership of the company. They're vital to the success of the firm.

And so I do think that when you look at -- you look at women in politics, you look at women in business, you look forward to the day when we will have a woman president and the glass ceiling is finally shattered, that there will just be more and more opportunities as the years unfold.

GREGORY; Can I just -- Ruth, do you feel like this has started something, and what is the it that it has started?

MARCUS:

Well, it has continued what I think of as the endless national discussion about women and gender and the workplace and family. It started 50 years ago. Betty Friedan, I suspect that not us but somebody is going to be sitting here 50 years from now having the same conversation.

Interestingly I asked my daughter who is a senior in high school, told her I was writing about this book. I said do you think about balancing work and family when you think about life ahead? And she said absolutely, yes, I do. And I said do the boys in your grade -- and before I could get the words out of my mouth, she said no way, they don't think about it at all, which is really interesting.

I want to say one thing about Sarah Palin. I thought -- you talked about jumping the queue. Yes, queue jumping is important, it's really important that when women jump the queue they are ready to jump the queue and they come with the background and expertise, otherwise it sets everybody back.

GREGORY:

Final point here, Marsha, then I've got to take a break.

BLACKBURN:

Yeah, women bring a diversity of experience. They travel a very circuitous route in their careers and bring all of this wealth of information. Working with their children, working in schools, all of these -- to the table and that is why I think they are more effective public policy makers many times than their male colleagues.

GREGORY:

And you write about that in your book and a good point to end on.

We're going to continue our roundtable discussion in just a minute. We'll talk some politics. We'll talk about it with Jeb Bush when I talk to him in a moment and get reaction from our group right after this.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

GREGORY; We are back and still talking about Sheryl Sandberg's book, but we're going to move on. We're going to have to get this conversation going again, because there's a lot more to do. Earlier this week I spoke with former Florida Governor Jeb Bush, who is out with a new book aimed at tackling the controversial issue of immigration. And of course we talked about his political future as well.

Here's part of that conversation.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

GREGORY:

You write in your book, and it's a fairly hard line, a grant of citizenship, and that's the important word, a grant of citizenship is an undeserving reward for conduct that we cannot afford to encourage.

You got some tough press treatment in all of this, this week.

BUSH:

Yeah.

GREGORY:

As you talked about your book, the Miami Herald, "Jeb Bush Reverses Stance on Immigration: No Citizenship Path for Undocumented." The National Journal, "Jeb Bush's Poorly Timed Flip-Flop on Immigration. Politico, "Bush Takes a U-Turn on Pathway to Citizenship."

I reviewed some of the things you said before. Why did you change your view on this?

BUSH:

First of all, my view has been that in order to get comprehensive reform we could take either path, either a path to citizenship or a path to legalization. The important point is that illegal immigrants should not get better benefits at a lower cost than people that have been waiting patiently. So assume we pass the law this year, and I hope that's the case, five years from now we should look back and there should be fewer people coming illegally because we have an open legal system. Both of those paths could create that as long as you change the rest of the system as well.

So what's going on in the Senate and in the House right now is very positive. I support what Senators Graham and Rubio and McCain and Flake are doing with their Democratic counterparts. And if they can find a path to get to a path to citizenship over the long haul, then I would support that.

But this book was written to try to get people against reform to be for it. It is a place where I think a lot of conservatives should feel comfortable that there's a way to do this and not violate their principles.

GREGORY:

You know, it's interesting, there's obviously a political component to this about who wants what kind of deal and what does it mean after we move forward. After Romney lost, a lot of focus on the Hispanic vote in this country and the Republican Party's problem with Hispanic. It's interesting, one of the things that Romney says, right, to his donors after he loses is, what the president's campaign did was focus on certain members of his base coalition, give them extraordinary financial gifts from the government, and then work very aggressively to turn them out to vote. That was with a campaign call with donors.

Do you think there's a view, and do you share it, among Republicans that to allow illegal immigrants who are now in this country to become citizens would in effect be able to create all new Democratic voters that would deeply hurt the Republican Party's chances of winning national elections?

BUSH:

No, I don't believe that. I mean if you look at Asian Americans, for example, in general they have higher income than the median of our country, more intact families, more entrepreneurship, higher levels of education and they supported President Obama 75-24, higher margins than with Hispanics.

I think there's a problem that's a little bit bigger and it goes back to my belief that we need to be offering a compelling alternative, an alternative that says that the lack of social mobility needs to be addressed not by higher taxes and more government, but giving people the tools to rise up and to be successful, that an opportunity society is the path that we should be on. And that aspirational message could convince a lot of people that right now are supporting a more stasis kind of approach.

But we have to have the alternative. We have to actually advance the cause of freedom and of entrepreneurship and of building capacity so people can freely pursue their dreams as they see fit.

GREGORY:

Should it be disqualifying for a candidate in the future if they have hired an illegal immigrant, should that disqualify their run for office?

BUSH:

I don't know. That's a -- that's above my pay grade. I would hope that people try hard to make sure that they hire legal workers. It's the law.

GREGORY:

In 1998, your father wrote a letter where he talked about your winning as governor of Florida, made it quite clear that you were without any doubt going to become a major political figure in the country. I, of course, know the family by covering your brother in the White House for eight years. And the joke, I don't know if it's true, was always that your mom always thought it was going to be you before it would be him that would be president. Do you think about not disappointing mom as you think about a run for higher office?

BUSH:

I don't know what my mom's view on this. I'm not going to ask her either because I don't want to begin the process to think about it until the proper time to do so.

I'm proud of my family. My son is running for statewide office in Texas. Now I know what my dad feels like when he wrote those letters about George and i.

GREGORY:

How about the legacy of the Bush presidency. You'll be part of his library that's opening. It's hard to imagine that he's already at the pleasure of having a presidential library. But here he is. How do you think views are emerging about the Bush presidency, the second Bush presidency?

BUSH:

Well, I mean, it's hard to see. I can only attest to how people view my dad now. A lot of his accomplishments were overshadowed by the '92 election. And over time, people began to view my dad in a different light than they did shortly after his tenure as president.



Now I think everywhere I go, at least, he's a beloved guy and for good reason, because he's a spectacular human being and his four years as president, a lot of amazing accomplishments took place.

So my guess is that history will be kind to my brother the further out you get from this and the more people compare his tenure to what's going on now. I think history will be kind to George W. Bush.

GREGORY:

Governor, before I let you go, who's the hottest Florida politician right now? Is it you or Marco Rubio? Who are we more likely see in the White House?

BUSH:

Man, you guys are crack addicts. You really are obsessed with all this politics.

GREGORY:

You know, I've been called a lot of things ...

BUSH:

Marco Rubio is a great guy.

OK, heroin addicts, is that better? I mean, put aside the politics for a moment. We've got big challenges. And Marco Rubio to his credit is working on those and he deserves a lot of credit for it. I'm very proud of him.

GREGORY:

All right. Well, more questions for a different day. Governor Bush, thank you.

BUSH:

Take care.

(END VIDEOTAPE)

GREGORY:

We can't put aside the politics, just not possible.

We're back with our roundtable.

Steve Schmidt, interesting week for 2016 potential candidates. We put them on our cork board here, everyone from Rand Paul and then Jeb Bush, a lot of activity. How did Jeb Bush come out of the gate if that's what this was?

SCHMIDT:

Well, he had a rough week politically because he reversed his position on immigration, but it won't matter in the long run. He's not the first politician to do a flip-flop, you know, getting ready for a presidential run.

But it's important to remember he's always been a voice of reason on this immigration issue. He's always been a voice of reform. He's one of the deep policy thinkers in the Republican Party. He was an extraordinarily effective governor of the state of Florida. And if he decides to run for president, he will be a very, very formidable candidate.

GREGORY:

What about Rand Paul? I mean, so much praise really, bipartisan praise for Rand Paul as really beginning something of a more youthful, grassroots conservative movement that could run -- end up being a run in 2016?

MARCUS:

Well, it was fun to watch the filibuster. I thought he was filibustering about the wrong question, that he was filibustering about the notion that we could be sitting here and drones could rain down on us from the sky. That's not the real question about drones. The real question about drones is what's happening overseas, what are -- how much, where, what authorization, what legal basis.

But it is nice to see a real filibuster and it is nice to -- and it just illustrates some of the divisions in the Republican Party -- social conservatives, fiscal conservatives, isolationists, neocons, and strong executive branch conservatives like George W. Bush versus get the government out of my business conservatives like Rand Paul.

SCHMIDT:

Ruth, I really disagree. He did ask an important question and that is are there limits to executive power under

our current war situation domestically. He got the wrong answer, an equivocal answer from the White House.

MARCUS:

He doesn't know. And he wouldn't take the no for an answer.

SCHMIDT:

He got a firm answer after he did this.

But for sure I think Rand Paul arrived as a national figure.

GREGORY:

Let me get -- congresswoman, I just want to change it slightly before I let all of us go here, which is Ashley Judd. There's news this morning that she wants to run in Kentucky to challenge Mitch McConnell. She is of course actually has residency in Tennessee. How do you handicap her prospects?

BLACKBURN:

She is one of my constituents. she is a friend of mine. And on election day in November, Ashley and I stood at the polls and snapped a picture and tweeted it out.

GREGORY:

Could she win?

BLACKBURN:

It shows that people who have differences of opinion -- if she runs, she will run hard. And knowing that family, they are very tenacious and spirited.

GREGORY:

Wow, how about that? That's a fabulous nonanswer.

We're going to leave it there and go to a break. We'll be back in a moment.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

GREGORY:

Thanks to all of you. Terrific discussion -- sorry our audience can't still be with us. We'll continue for a few minutes.

That is all for today, we'll be back next week. If it's Sunday, it's Meet the Press.

CQ Transcriptions, March 10, 2013

---

## List of Speakers

DAVID GREGORY, HOST

REP. CORY GARDNER, R-COLO.

SEN. TOM COBURN, R-OKLA.

REP. TULSI GABBARD, D-HAWAII

SEN. TIM KAINE, D-VA.

FORMER GOV. JEB BUSH, R-FLA.

FORMER REP. JOE SCARBOROUGH, R-FLA.

REP. MARSHA BLACKBURN, R-TENN.

RUTH MARCUS, WASHINGTON POST

DEE DEE MYERS, FORMER WHITE HOUSE PRESS SECRETARY

STEVE SCHMIDT, GOP STRATEGIST

Source: **CQ Transcriptions**

*All materials herein are protected by United States copyright law and may not be reproduced, distributed, transmitted, displayed, published or broadcast without the prior written permission of CQ Transcriptions. You may not alter or remove any trademark, copyright or other notice from copies of the content.*

© 2013 CQ Roll Call All Rights Reserved.